MDOT
Michigan Department of Transportation

ENGINEERING OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
MAY 1, 2003 – 9:00 A.M.
EXECUTIVE CONFERENCE ROOM

Present:	L. E. Tibbits	J. Friend	T. Anderson
	B. J. O'Brien	C. Roberts	M. VanPortFleet
	J. D. Culp	T. E. Davies	J. W. Reincke
	T. Fudaly		
Absent:	S. Bower		
Guests:	K. Kennedy	C. Bleech	N. Lefke
	M. Dionise	M. DeLong	C. Libiran

The May EOC meeting was the last one for Thom Davies, University Region Engineer. For the last several years, Thom has served as the region representative on the committee. We would like to acknowledge his leadership, knowledge and experience as having benefited not only EOC, but all of MDOT and the State of Michigan. His contributions have been far reaching, his observations and reflections insightful, and his opinions candid and on target. The committee deeply appreciates Thom's dedication to service and to doing what is right and doing it at the right time. It has been a great working relationship, Thom, and we wish you the very best in your retirement!

OLD BUSINESS

1. **Approval of the Minutes of the April 7, 2003, Meeting – L. E. Tibbits**

   Minutes of the April 7, 2003, meeting were approved.

2. **AASHTO *A Policy on the Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*, 2001 Edition (2001 Green Book) (See March 10, 2003, Minutes, New Business, Item 2) – C. Libiran**

   At the March meeting, EOC requested a comparative review of non-freeway applications similar to the one given for freeways. The review was completed and our standards and guidelines are in compliance with the new AASHTO publication. Some recommendations were made to amend and clarify the tables.

   ACTION: The adoption of the 2001 AASHTO Green Book is approved with minor wording modifications, as noted. A letter will be sent to FHWA indicating our adoption of the AASHTO standards.

NEW BUSINESS

1. **Process for Including Utility Work in MDOT Construction Contracts – M. DeLong, M. Dionise, and N. Lefke**

The procedure for including work performed on behalf of a utility company in our contracts has not worked as well as intended. Following process re-engineering, several major improvements have been incorporated to strengthen the procedure. These improvements include combining the road and bridge procedures into one, invoicing the utility companies promptly, and setting the utility work as a lump sum not to exceed the biddable item. The new process was reviewed and approved by the regions.

ACTION: The new procedure is approved. It will be included in the Design Manual and appropriate staff will be notified.

2. Non-Competitive Bid Guidelines – M. VanPortFleet

A procedure was developed in the 1980s to administer projects where a local agency performs work on their federal aid routes rather than contracting out the work. Local agencies were often able to keep their work crews busy in the summer and avoid laying off their winter maintenance crews. In the spring of 2002, the Michigan Road Builders Association (MRBA) objected to the use of this process on several jobs, indicating that state and federal regulations required the projects to be competitively bid. MDOT and FHWA reviewed the regulations and determined that the procedures needed to be revised, updated and clarified.

A workshop was held in August 2002 to gain consensus of MRBA, the Michigan Municipal League (MML), the County Road Association of Michigan (CRAM), FHWA, and MDOT on a procedure to continue a non-competitive bid method on local agency work. An agreement was not reached, therefore, a new guideline has been developed by MDOT that is consistent with state and federal regulations and allows MDOT to process non-competitive bid requests of the local agencies. The committee members were advised that although MRBA, CRAM, and MML supported much of the language in the document, CRAM and MML do not approve of the procedures due to a project limit reduction to $100,000. FHWA has found the procedure acceptable.

ACTION: The new guidelines are in conformance with state and federal regulations and are approved. The department and FHWA will work with any local agency that applies to perform work under this guideline. Formal approval from FHWA will be requested. The department will continue to keep the guidelines open for future changes, provided there is an agreement between CRAM, MML, MRBA, and FHWA.

3. **Bureau of Highway Instructional Memorandum 2003-05, *2003 Edition of the MDOT Construction Manual* – J. W. Reincke**

The *Construction Manual* was revised to reflect the changes incorporated in the *2003 Standard Specifications for Construction*. All manual holders will be notified of the 2003 edition's availability.

ACTION: The revisions to the *Construction Manual* are approved. The IM was signed and will be distributed.

4. Pavement Selection, Reconstruct M-59/US-23 Interchange, CS 47014/47082, JN 34519 – K. Kennedy

The reconstruction alternates considered were a hot mix asphalt (HMA) pavement (Alternate 1 – Equivalent Uniform Annual Cost [EUAC] $82,295/mile) and a jointed plain concrete pavement using a P1 modified concrete mix (Alternate 2 – EUAC $85,086/mile).

A life cycle cost analysis was performed and Alternate 1 was approved based on having the lowest EUAC. The pavement design and cost analysis are as follows:

Alternate 1 (76.38 Percent of the Project) Reconstruct: HMA

2"....HMA 4E30, Top Course (Mainline and Inside Shoulder)
2.5"....HMA 4E30, Leveling Course (Mainline and Inside Shoulder)
3"....HMA 3E30, Base Course (Mainline and Inside Shoulder)
3.55"....HMA 3E30, Base Course (Mainline)
5.5"....HMA 4C and 3C (Outside Shoulder)
6"....Aggregate Base (9.55" Inside Shoulder, 11.55" Outside Shoulder)
12"....Existing Sand Subbase
6"....Subbase Underdrains
35.05"....Total Thickness

Alternate 1B (23.62 Percent of the Project) Reconstruct: HMA

2"....HMA 4E10, Top Course
3"....HMA 3E10, Leveling Course
3.68"....HMA 3E10, Base Course
6"....Aggregate Base
18"....Proposed Subbase
6"....Subbase Underdrains
32.68"....Total Thickness

US-23 Present Value Initial Construction Costs..... $1,108,511/mile
US-23 Present Value Initial User Costs..... $117,394/mile
US-23 Present Value Maintenance Costs $225,012/mile
US-23 Equivalent Uniform Annual Cost..... $89,794/mile

M-59 Present Value Initial Construction Costs $787,240/mile
M-59 Present Value Initial User Costs $26,617/mile
M-59 Present Value Maintenance Costs..... $202,163/mile
M-59 Equivalent Uniform Annual Cost $58,045/mile

Equivalent Uniform Annual Cost $82,295/mile

5. **New Region Representative – L. Tibbits**

Roger Safford, Grand Region Engineer, will be joining EOC as the new region representative at the June meeting. Welcome Roger!

(Signed Copy on File at C&T)
Jon W. Reincke, Secretary
Engineering Operations Committee

JWR:kar

cc: EOC Members
Region Engineers
G. J. Jeff
R. J. Lippert, Jr.
J. Ruszkowski
R. D. Till
C. Libiran
M. DeLong
K. Rothwell
T. Phillips
K. Peters
T. L. Nelson
D. A. Juntunen
J. Steele (FHWA)
J. Murner (MRPA)
A. C. Milo (MRBA)
R. J. Risser, Jr. (MCPA)
D. Hollingsworth (MCA)
J. Becsey (MAPA)
M. Newman (MAA)
M. Nystrom (AUC)